

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/691,731	Applicant(s) BERGHOF ET AL.
	Examiner Jehanne S. Sitton	Art Unit 1634

All Participants:**Status of Application:** final rejection(1) Jehanne S. Sitton.

(3) _____.

(2) Brian Malkin.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 October 2009**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

22, 29

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Jehanne S Sitton/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the claims should be amended to recite "the complement" so as to make clear that the claimed recitation referred to the exact complement of the indicated SEQ ID NO: and to provide consistency with the claims in the allowed parent patent. Applicant representative agreed to the changes in the attached examiner's amendment and also requested correction of the misspelling of the term "contiguous" in claim 29.